Tells the Facts and Names the Names

$2.50

CounterPunch

June 1-15, 2002 *Alexander Cockburn and Jeffrey St. Clair* VOL. 9, NO. 11

In This Issue

GOD'S COUNTRY

- How the Anti-Defamation League Learned to Love the Christian Right
- It Began with Begin and Falwell; It Continued with Abe Foxman and Ralph Reed
- And Yes, It's All About Israel

IS OSAMA IN GEORGIA?

- Almost Certainly Not, But It Sure Suits the US and Shevardnadze to Pretend that He Might Be.
- And, Yes, It Is All About Oil

KUCINICH FOR PREZ?

- Not if Katha Pollitt Had Anything to Say About It

"There is an anti-democratic, anti-individual mandate at work in Democrat politics that has a take-no-prisoners approach to abortion rights."

Life, Death and Kucinich

First, some explanatory words from your Editors.

Coincidental with his 90th birthday Studs Terkel recently offered Ohio Rep Dennis Kucinich as the best hope for a progressive candidate seeking the highest office. Here at CounterPunch we like Dennis most of the time. Indeed, we liked him back in the fall of 1979 when as the young mayor of Cleveland he went head to head with the city's business establishment on the issue of public power, and spent almost twenty years in the political wilderness for his principles. Since he got into the House we've noted that he shows up among the 30 or so radicals who can be counted on, most of the time, to stand up for the Bill of Rights or against war on the poor and the oppressed, at home and abroad. Dennis isn't perfect of course. For example we weren't too happy with his timid "present" vote, when the Israel lobby shoved an All-for-Sharon vote through Congress this spring.

Right after Studs Terkel issued his imprimatur, The Nation's Katha Pollitt dropped what she evidently considered to be the Big One. Kucinich is against abortion, Pollitt proclaimed. He's always been against it, and in Congress his opposition has been active. That, so far as Pollitt is concerned, is it. When it comes to choosing leaders for the progressive forces, Kucinich need not apply. Other liberal columnists hastened to agree.

Yes, these are the same liberals now howling that the progressive movement will stand and fall on the efforts of Paul Wellstone to win a third term in the US Senate. Yes, this is the same Wellstone who announced in 1990 that he was never going to be an insider, but one who wanted to build a mass movement from his bully pulpit in the US Senate; the same Wellstone who pledged only two terms; the same Wellstone who has become an okay, not-as-bad-as-most, pretty conventional and somewhat underachieving member of the Democratic caucus; the same Wellstone who, with just one lonely vote, could have made a decisive difference. Back in the aftermath of the presidential election in November 2000, just the sort of people in America Wellstone pledged to represent were having their voting rights trashed in Florida. It needed one US senator to vote in protest, to help rally the opposition, and Wellstone shirked the assignment. It's one of the reasons why we think it's just fine for Ed McGaa to run as a Green challenger in the Minnesota senatorial race.

Why the forgiveness for Wellstone, but the thumbs down for Kucinich? This brings us to the current dismal state of the women's movement, as embodied in the National Organization of Women and kindred outfits. Back in the fall of 2000 we printed Ellen Johnson's scathing assessment of the crimped outlook of these groups. We asked her for an update, after Pollitt's fatwa on Kucinich. Here it is.

KUCINICH AND NOW

BY ELLEN JOHNSON

Katha Pollitt's article "Regressive Progressive" reads like Election 2000 redux, featuring NOW's hackneyed, one-dimensional view of politics and politicians. Pollitt praises Congressman Dennis

(**Kucinich& NOW** *continued on page 2)*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kucinich's long record of support for progressive causes but ultimately rebukes him for committing the unforgivable sin: being pro-life. Despite his popularity among Democrats, in the eyes of many who subscribe to NOW's skewed interpretation of liberal tolerance, Kucinich's voting record on reproductive rights disqualifies him from ever pursuing a higher office.

During the 2000 election, NOW feminists ferociously promoted a single-issue agenda focused around preserving access to abortion, enlisting columnists like Pollitt to overstate the threat a Bush victory would have on Supreme Court nominations and the women's movement, in general. As a card carrying Green, I was inundated with emails from the likes of Whoopie Goldberg, Sarah Jessica Parker and other NOW star pals urging me to "relax" "sit down and take a deep breath" and consider how my support of Nader would condemn women to once again seek back alley abortions and set the women's movement back 30 years. This crude campaign to elect Gore regrettably gave resonance to conservative Laura Ingraham's election night parody of NOW feminists whining, "I want my abortions! Gimme my abortions!"

The residual effect of such stridency, rearing its ugly head once more in Pollitt's hit piece on Kucinich,, is an increasing discomfort many liberals feel toward NOW and feminism in general. This discomfort erodes support for many causess liberals have worked for in the last few decades, causes that, ideally, could create an environment where abortion is less necessary. Furthermore, Pollitt's rejection of Kucinich as a viable candidate for president, deriving from the fear that women will lose the right to control their bodies, is part and parcel of the belittling of women as helpless victims. The feminist movement was based on battling this stereotype. (This reminds me of the evidence 19th century physicians gave to prohibit women from speaking in public—that women were all "body" in constant danger of parturition.)

After 150 years of women's rights advocacy, do we really have only two choices: to have an abortion or not to have an abortion? In an interview with the Congressman, Pollitt dismisses Kucinich's "wish to see abortion made rare by providing women with more social supports and better health care, by requiring more responsibility from men and so on."

And so on? Gee Katha, wouldn't those "and so ons" you admit Kucinich has been a leader on grant women more control over their lives? Wouldn't a true feminist victory occur when women have many choices — access to quality health care so reproduction is controlled systematically and before an unplanned pregnancy occurs; to have access to education, job training, and quality child care so she can earn a livable wage and thus, choose to raise a child; to be able to depend on regular child support from the other parent? To assume that abortion rights should take precedence over issues concerning the material conditions women, men, and children living in the US struggle with on a daily basis is insular, at best, and elitist, at worst.

In fact, Pollitt's article is riddled with elitist stereotypes, making her dogma consistent with the snobbery many liberals have come to associate with NOW. She reports that Kucinich is a "New-Agish Vegan" but that he has a web page devoted to "Polka, Bowling and Kielbasa," situating him as some kind of liberal traitor—a "man of the people . . . forever chasing the white male working- class vote." She attributes his anti-abortion stance to his Catholic upbringing. Why? Because interpolation by said religion can be the only reason why a sane liberal would choose to side with such a conservative position?

Of course, Pollitt's perceptions are free of any ideological positioning, right? Wrong. Because as many liberals closeted by their conflicting views on abortion understand, there is an anti-democratic, anti-individual mandate at work in Democrat politics that has a take-no-prisoners approach to abortion rights which states, in effect, that you are either with them or against them. Kucinich's future beyond his current position is certainly imperiled by the prejudice shown by Pollitt and other mainstream pro-abortion activists.

But whether Pollitt and friends want to believe it, many liberals have mixed feelings about abortion. Legalized abortion is a temporary solution to a problem and does not enhance women's lives, per se. To focus all the energy of a movement around provisional solutions instead of vigorously advocating for deep, structural change is antithetical to feminist principles. I assume that even Pollitt, Whoopie, and Sarah Jessica do not want legalized abortion to be the goal of feminism, but rather a temporary solution. Yet, their advocacy does not ever seem to reach beyond the access stage.

The abortion discussion makes everyone crazy and the drama surrounding the issue reflects more than just the idea about when life begins; it is intimately tied to an individual's beliefs about a whole host of complex issues, such as human sexuality, family structure, and spirituality, to name a few. To promote it as an either/or debate is reductive, uncreative, and, dare I say, conservative. NOW feminists like Pollitt give lip service to the idea that "choice" means more than one choice, but when push comes to shove, anyone questioning abortion is a traitor to the cause. Pollitt's tacit declaration that Kucinich's anti-abortion votes are tantamount to the oppression of women is dim.

If Kucinich and other liberal politicians work to make the reasons for abortion less necessary, then Pollitt and Company are not doing NOW or the Democrat party any favors by jettisoning dynamic candidates to promote the anemic palaver that has been eroding both groups' support base for years.

Ms. Pollitt, it's time to move on.

Ellen Johnson is a Green Party member and who teaches English at Arizona State University in Tempe.

Editors
Alexander Cockburn
Jeffrey St. Clair

Business
Becky Grant (Manager)
Anna Amezcua

Design
Deborah Thomas

Counselor
Ben Sonnenberg

Published twice monthly except August, 22 issues a year:
$40 individuals,
$100 institutions/supporters
$30 student/low-income
CounterPunch.
All rights reserved.
CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558
1-800-840-3683 (phone)
counterpunch@counterpunch.org
www.counterpunch.org

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ADL AND THE CHRISTIAN RIGHT: A Marriage Made in Heaven

BY JEFFREY BLANKFORT

A political love affair that began almost a quarter-century ago between Menachem Begin, Israel's newly elected Prime Minister and Rev. Jerry Falwell, the founder of the Christian Fundamentalist Moral Majority, a relationship that shocked American Jews at the time, has apparently been consummated in an equally strange marriage between leading representatives of the two communities.

On May 2, the Anti-Defamation League, which at one time had led the Jewish organizational opposition to the domestic agenda of the Christian right and had been troubled by the Falwell connection, published a half page ad in the New York Times featuring a strong statement in support of Israel that Ralph Reed, the founder of the Christian Coalition, a younger, slicker version of Falwell, had written as an op-ed piece for the Los Angeles Times. Back in 1977, Begin's election had stunned the then liberal Jewish community leadership. This was a man, after all, who, as head of the Irgun, had proudly accepted the label of "terrorist" after his bombing of the King David Hotel killed 97 British soldiers and civil servants and who had directed the massacre of 253 Palestinian non-combatants in the Jerusalem suburb of Der Yassin in April 1948 (two events, it should be noted, that the Internet Encarta Encyclopedia have conveniently excised from his biography).

Justifying America's continued support of Israel at that point took an extraordinary effort by Jewish spokesmen. Twenty-five years later, after much practice, the apologies for the actions of the odious Ariel Sharon flow easily off their tongues. As for Begin's embracing of Falwell, they either politely dissociated themselves from it or ignored it. Now, with Israel's barbaric behavior drawing condemnation from everywhere but Washington, the Jewish organizations are welcoming support from whatever quarter they can get it.

So love, in this case for Israel, conquers all--although that may not be how ADL National Director Abe Foxman would put it. In 1994, the ADL published a report entitled, "The Religious Right: The Assault on Tolerance and Pluralism in America" which acknowledged the fundamentalist Christians' backing of Israel but at the time the organization did not accept that as sufficient basis for an alliance. This position was, of course, consistent with the ADL's self-heralded status as the nation's foremost "expert" on diversity and tolerance.

What prevented the ADL and its sister organizations in the Jewish establishment from embracing the Christian Zionists (as they are now called) were key differences on such hot domestic items as school prayer, a woman's right to choose, and to a lesser extent, gay rights. Those differences remain but the times and the priorities of the Jewish organizations have changed, as those of their new Christian friends have not.

The Jewish Zionists' claim is based on their view of Yahweh as a real estate agent.The Christian Zionists insist that the Jewish return to Israel is a prerequisite for Christ's Second Coming.

The ADL's Foxman, dismissing those who have criticized the group's implied endorsement of Reed, told the Jewish paper Forward (May 10), "I am proud to have Ralph Reed as a friend and as an advocate on Israel." Foxman told the Forward that he wished he could make alliances with politically liberal Christians, but they tended to be weak in their support for Israel. Foxman's placement of the ad was not done in a vacuum, but appeared to be in conjunction with what the Forward described as "stepped up" Jewish outreach to America's right-wing Christian groups. In the same week the ADL ad appeared, the Israeli Embassy hosted a prayer breakfast which also served as a political strategy session in which Falwell, the 700 Club's Pat Robertson, Michael Little, president of the Christian Broadcasting Network, and Alonzo Short, a member of the board of the Promise Keepers, were listed on the invitations as event hosts.

Embassy officials told Forward that the goal of the event was "to leverage and coordinate Christian support for Israel within the evangelical community". From the Jewish Zionist perspective, aside from their domestic differences, there had been very good reasons for looking warily at such right-wing Christian support. The Jewish Zionists' claim is based on their view of Yahweh as a real estate agent who gave them the land and made them his "chosen people". The Christian Zionists insist that the Jewish return to Israel is a prerequisite for Christ's Second Coming, but when he returns at some unspecified date, only those who desert Judaism and recognize him as the Lord will be "saved." The rest, presumably, will go to hell.

The Jewish Zionists may be crazy, but they're not that crazy. They know that the Christian scenario isn't going to happen, and most, if not all, are apparently willing to trade what is left of their liberal lipspeak for support from a powerful ally. Still, some comments from their new friends have caused dismay in the Jewish community. In a recent speech at a Baptist Church, according to the Washington Post, Republican House Whip Tom De Lay, who has been outspoken in his support for Israel, said, "Only Christianity offers a comprehensive worldview that covers all areas of life and thought. Only Christianity offers a way to live in response to the realities that we find in this world—only Christianity." And, at an Israel solidarity rally in San Antonio, Texas, at which, at least half of the participants were church members, a minister told the crowd, "Eventually we will all be in Jerusalem as brides of Christ." At that point, Ariel Sharon's tanks would be of little use.

Jeffrey Blankfort described his victory over the ADL in the notorious spying case in a recnent issue of CounterPunch.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Who's Afraid of the Pankisi Gorge?

By Chad Nagle

On February 11, Philip Remmler, acting US ambassador to the ex-Soviet republic of Georgia, publicly stated that several dozen associates of Osama bin Laden were operating in the Pankisi Gorge, a twelve-mile stretch of shallow valley slightly northwest of the Georgian capital, Tbilisi. A few days later, the Georgian Ministry of State Security announced the presence of Afghan mujahideen in the "gorge". The reports portended the US military's arrival to Georgia to confront the "terrorist threat" because, As Remmler said in his speech, America was prepared to "help any country fight al-Qaeda".

On February 15, Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov said he could not "rule out" the possibility that Osama bin Laden himself might be hiding out in the Pankisi Gorge and urged "maximum cooperation of the world community in any place where terrorism is being fought". Even Georgian President Eduard Shevardnadze, who had reason to lick his lips over the implications of a US military presence for his coffers, ridiculed the Russian "OBL" theory. But Russian Defense Minister Sergei Ivanov came to his colleague's defense on February 18, insisting that no one had disproved bin Laden was hiding in the Pankisi Gorge, and leaving Shevardnadze with the pointless task of proving a negative. Vladimir Putin's government, having already given the nod to American military intervention in Central Asia, was now pressing for the US armed forces' speedy arrival in another Russian backyard.

On March 1, Russian television reported that the Pankisi Gorge had been completely sealed off, and American pilots were flying Iroquois helicopters (a gift to Georgia) around Tbilisi as part of a training operation. On March 13, Defense Minister Ivanov – in a joint press conference with US Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld – claimed that "terrorists" were "sitting tight" in the Pankisi Gorge, and a little over a week later Georgia's Minister of Security also publicly expressed his suspicion that al-Qaeda operatives were in the area. As the Pankisi drama unfolded, Western media coverage of the opening of a new front in the "war on terror" remained scant and low-key.

Having visited Georgia many times and even met a few Chechens in Tbilisi, I found it impossible to believe either that bin Laden could be enjoying haven anywhere in the republic, or that Chechen rebels could be allied with al-Qaeda. The more I studied the unfolding story, the more it looked like a smokescreen for a hidden agenda. An official transcript of a press conference given by US Joint Chiefs of Staff Vice Chairman Gen. Peter Pace and Assistant Secretary of Defense Victoria Clarke, dated February 27th, reads as follows:

The latest US military adventure in Georgia appears to have nothing to do with Osama bin Laden, al-Qaeda, or any terrorist threat to ordinary Americans. Instead, it's all about oil.

Q: General, what specifically do you see as the concern in the Pankisi Gorge area? And do you believe that al-Qaeda is taking weapons there? And if you can just elaborate on what that situation –

Pace: As you know, we are tracking terrorist organizations worldwide. I believe the secretary said there's al-Qaeda representation in at least 60 countries that we know of. So I would not focus in on one particular area as a particular concern. We're trying; as best we can, to find the linkages worldwide and work with friendly governments worldwide to assist them in their own internal security problems.

Q: But why Georgia?

Pace: Georgia right now is very much – the two things I've told you about. One is the helicopters [UH-1 Huey helicopters provided in October], and two is working with that government to see if there is training and equipping that we can do with them that will assist them to become more proficient inside their own borders with their own security forces to take care of their own problems.

Q: Right. But what's your terrorism concern there? Why are you concerned about it in terms of the war on terrorism?

Pace: I did not say I was concerned.

Clarke: We are concerned that the al-Qaeda alone has cells in 50 or 60 countries around the world.

Q: But now wait a minute, wait a minute – If there's no concern about terrorism in this region, what is the concern, then?

Pace: I answered the gentleman's question about what my concern was, because I didn't say – because I didn't say I had a concern.

Q: I mean, you talked about the helicopters. There's no concern about –

Pace: No, no, we are –

Q: – terrorism in that particular region?

Pace: Please. We are concerned about terrorism worldwide, and we spend an enormous amount of energy trying to track the linkages with al-Qaeda and the other terrorist networks worldwide. I cannot get into specifics of what we know about terrorist networks in specific countries. That would be inappropriate for me to do from this stand. Clearly anywhere there are terrorists in the world, we are concerned. But I cannot quantify that for you from this platform.

Q: Do you believe it's possible that members of al-Qaeda have gone to the region? And is there any link between Chechnya and al-Qaeda?

Pace: It is possible, and that is possible.

Q: Well, then wait a minute. Could you elaborate on that – That's a great soundbite.

Pace: I cannot.

Q: Until recently, Shevardnadze denied that there were any Chechens on his soil, and as I understood it, U.S. officials believed approximately the same thing. What has changed your mind? How recently has your mind been changed? I mean is there anything you can give us? I mean, you make it sound like Georgia's just another country, like England. But you happen to be sending helicopters there.

Clarke: I'll try two things. One, we have had a military-to-military relationship and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ongoing activities with Georgia well before September 11th. Secondly, we have, as we said, been focused very hard on the fact that al-Qaeda has cells in 50 or 60 different countries around the world. There have been some indications of connections – some connections of al-Qaeda in that country. But going beyond that saying there have been some connections is not appropriate.

Q: You just said there were some connections, didn't you? I mean – I don't mean to confuse –

Clarke: That's what I'm saying. We – it's not appropriate for us to go into any great detail about what we know.

Was Washington being so secretive over the military operation for "national security" reasons, or were there other motives? Chechnya's rebel government was consistently dismissing as a lie the claim that Chechen rebels were cooperating with al-Qaeda. But while this might have been expected, the Georgian intelligence service's public statement on March 14 – that "no evidence" connected anyone in the Pankisi Gorge with al-Qaeda – was not. Georgia's security service also claimed that information indicating a hundred Chechen fighters were in the gorge, "if they can be considered fighters, was sketchy at best.

Late in May, I came across a story on the Internet about a couple of freelance journalists who had entered the gorge on April 6:

"[O]n the day we visited, it was relatively quiet. We entered Pankisi using a local taxi that, to our surprise, was waved through two checkpoints manned with well-armed Georgian soldiers. We then walked through the main village of Duisi. From there, we took local transport through the entire populated area of the valley without seeing any evidence of the Georgian security forces.

We interviewed a number of locals, including refugees from Chechnya, who told us that the so-called "Gorge" was calm. When we asked about conflict and lawlessness people shook their heads. People were mostly concerned with the poverty of the area – anyone with money fled the region as fast as they could. Residents claimed that no humanitarian aid, with the exception of wheat flour, had arrived since the previous year. Children, people said, were not able to receive full schooling."

The journalists, Philip O'Ceallaigh and Jeffrey Silverman, were detained at a checkpoint for an hour and a half, and then again in the Pankisi Gorge's main village of Duisi for a couple of hours. Apparently journalists were not supposed to enter the gorge without an armed escort. Both were let go without incident after their documents were inspected, and returned to Tbilisi peacefully.

Under the auspices of observing the local elections on June 2, I showed up at the checkpoint outside the village of Matani as an officially accredited election monitor exercising my right to travel anywhere on the territory of Georgia. A wide, green, gentle valley stretched out before me, dotted with sleepy villages. This was the "gorge". I counted ten bored-looking men in camouflage fatigues, Kalashnikovs slung over their shoulders. They stopped the car, and as they checked out my documents, one of the younger soldiers who spoke a little English came over to the car to talk to me. I noticed that, instead of regulation army boots, he was wearing a pair of beat-up white Nike sneakers.

"We are KGB", he said, before making the usual small talk (what state was I from, how could he obtain a visa to America, etc.). I told him I had read that al-Qaeda terrorists were hiding in the Pankisi Gorge, and maybe even Osama bin Laden himself. He asked me where I had read this, and I told him reports to that effect had appeared in the West. Smiling derisively, he queried: "Do you believe that?"

As cheerfully as possible, I repeated my request to go into the Pankisi Gorge to view the voting. Four or five of the slovenly guards huddled to debate the question briefly in Georgian, leaving me out of the conversation. As I waited, I noticed a couple of ordinary vehicles being waved through the checkpoint into the gorge without stopping. Despite al-Qaeda's reign of terror, therefore, residents seemed to be going about their day-to-day lives as normal.

When, finally, the highest-ranking member of the group walked towards me with his walkie-talkie in hand, and informed me that without official permission from the security ministry, there was no way he could take responsibility for my security, I asked him what sort of people in the gorge posed a danger to my person. He answered, simply: "Different sorts of people". Were they al-Qaeda, I asked? Again: "Different sorts". I suggested to him that I wasn't being denied entry for my personal safety, but to prevent me from finding out there wasn't anything there to see. This comment, however, received no comment from the poker-faced security guard.

Back in Tbilisi, I met a Chechen war veteran named Elbert Sayiyev who had lived in the Pankisi Gorge after fleeing Chechnya during the genocidal Russian bombardment of 1999. Missing a leg, he said the Pankisi Gorge story was a hoax. The idea of al-Qaeda operatives hiding there was ridiculous – something Shevardnadze had thought up to get money from the West. Interestingly, a couple of days before the June 2 elections (as rigged and dirty looking as any in Georgia since Shevardnadze took control in 1992), the Georgian government received $25 million from Washington to help it fight the "war on terror".

Sayiyev said there were refugees in the Pankisi Gorge, and that crime (mostly smuggling) had followed from war, poverty and homelessness. But the Pankisi Gorge didn't even directly border Chechnya, and the notion of even Chechen rebel fighters there – never mind al-Qaeda – was absurd. Pointing to his prosthetic limb, the fabric of his trouser leg outlining the metal knee-joint, he added: "If there are fighters there, they're fighters like me".

In all likelihood, the Pankisi Gorge story is a decoy. The real reason behind the US intervention lies further West in Georgia. On March 4, the government of the Republic of Abkhazia – a separatist state on the Black Sea coast that broke away from Georgia after a bloody war in the early 1990s – issued the following statement:

The declarations of representatives of the Georgian leadership about preparations, with

SUBSCRIPTION INFO

Enter/Renew Subscription here:

One year individual, $40
($35 email only / $45 email/print)
One year institution/supporters $100
One year student/low income, $30
T-shirts, $17
Please send back issue(s)
_____ ($5/issue)

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

_____

Payment must accompany order, or just dial 1-800-840-3683 and renew by credit card. Add $17.50 for foreign subscriptions. If you want CounterPunch emailed to you please supply your email address. Make checks payable to: **CounterPunch**
Business Office
PO Box 228, Petrolia, CA 95558

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

US assistance, for an operation to restore order in the Pankisi gorge are only a part of a campaign of misinformation to cover up a planned large-scale operation against Abkhazia, in which American formations may also be involved.

On the eve of the local elections, the president of the separatist Republic of South Ossetia made a similar claim, saying Russian intervention alone could guarantee peace. The president of the Autonomous Republic of Ajaria in western Georgia also publicly suggested US attack helicopters could be used to bring his territory under Tbilisi's direct rule.

These claims are far from far-fetched. Georgia serves as a transit corridor for Western-bound oil and gas from the Caspian Sea and Central Asia. With separatist mini-states lying in close proximity to the route of a pipeline currently under construction – from Baku, Azerbaijan, through Georgia to Ceyhan, Turkey – the route is less attractive than it might otherwise be. Under the auspices of fighting the "war on terror" therefore, Washington may be taking steps to eliminate pesky little national entities in the Caucasus by force.

Russia had previously been the main obstacle to the West's energy schemes in the Caucasus. The Kremlin once had an incentive to foil plans for oil and gas to bypass Russian territory while flowing to Western markets. But now Putin's government seeks the approximately $700-800 million annual revenue from a new pipeline, from the Russian Black Sea coast city of Novorossiysk to Ceyhan through Abkhazia and Georgia. Having received sufficient "incentives" from Washington, the Russian government is fully on board with America's new front in the "war on terror". It looks as if Putin's government was all along only interested in raising the price of Western "investment" in the ex-USSR, and the Bush-Putin summit earlier this year surely sealed the deal.

There is no reason to believe that truth has been a casualty of the "war on terror" any less than it has been in other wars. The Pentagon's failure to establish an "Office of Strategic Influence," designed to disseminate carefully concocted lies to protect "national security," did not consign disinformation to the ash heap of American foreign policy history. It just postponed its receipt of an official US government seal of approval.

The old Cold War-style disinformation tactics the West and the Soviet bloc used to employ to trick and divert each other's intelligence services – such as planting false reports in major newspapers like The Washington Post and New York Times – now seem quaintly archaic. The Russian government, headed by a former KGB functionary, is actually assisting Western disinformation, as revealed by the Pankisi Gorge saga. Only now it looks as if the policy of deception is directed not at an opposing military-political bloc, but against ordinary citizens.

Osama bin Laden in many ways represents the perfect enemy for the War Party, because so much about him can conveniently remain a mystery. Is he even alive? Was he ever really the evil mastermind behind an elusive, omnipresent international terrorist network, or just a well-to-do dissident Saudi hoodlum financing camps for suicide bombers to get training on the cheap? Sadly, most Americans seem reluctant to ask questions, whether out of indifference or else a fear of being branded unpatriotic. Sure, US troops in Georgia are staying in a five-star hotel at $10,000 per night of taxpayers' money. But the president and his secretaries have labeled the terrorists "enemies of freedom" as opposed to simply enemies of peace, and woe betide anybody who questions the party line.

The latest US military adventure in Georgia appears to have nothing to do with Osama bin Laden, al-Qaeda, or any terrorist threat to ordinary Americans. Instead, it's all about oil. As "entrepreneurial opportunities" geometrically expand the duration and territorial reach of the "war on terror," we can expect to find ourselves living in a super-militarized world where less and less that we read or hear can be believed, and where life is close to a living hell for everyone except a tiny elite. Ironically, such a world closely resembles the kind we in the West claim to have defended ourselves against during the Cold War. CP

Under the auspices of fighting the "war on terror" Washington may be taking steps to eliminate pesky little national entities in the Caucasus by force.

CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558

Attention Subscribers: Don't use the Washington, DC address. Partly because of long delays because of the anthrax scare, we want all mail sent to the address above.

CounterPunch Visits the Supposed Lair of Osama

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED